arXiv:0801.0504v1 [math.CT] 3 Jan 2008

Quantum triads: an algebraic approach

David Kruml*

February 2, 2008

Keywords: Quantale, quantale module, couple of quantales, quantum frame, quantum triad.

Abstract

A concept of quantum triad and its solution is introduced. It represents a common framework for several situations where we have a quantale with a right module and a left module, provided with a bilinear inner product. Examples include Van den Bossche quantaloids, quantum frames, simple and Galois quantales, operator algebras, or orthomodular lattices.

1 Introduction

The lattice of ideals of a commutative ring is a very useful characteristic and provides to apply topological techniques in ring theory. When the ring is non-commutative, the two-sided ideals (T) are much less descriptive and we should rather consider lattices of right (R) or left (L) ideals, or even better all of them.

The lattices are naturally equipped by an associative multiplication which distributes over joins and this led J. C. Mulvey to introduce a concept of *quantale*. Quantales arising from right ideals were studied by many authors (see cf. [1, 3, 13], etc.). In [16] (see also [15]) G. Van den Bossche advanced an idea of F. W. Lawvere to consider the lattices L, T, R as hom-sets in a two-object quantaloid together with a lattice Q of all subgroups which are

---

*Supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under the grant No. 201/06/0664.

modules of a center:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bullet \arrow[loop left, "Q"] \arrow[r, bend left, "L"] & \bullet \arrow[loop right, "T"] \arrow[l, bend left, "R"]
\end{tikzcd} \qquad (*)$$

Notice that R, L are then considered as modules rather than quantales and that the scheme preserves a quite important multiplication $L \times R \to T$. This importance is well visible when we are dealing with an operator algebra A and the ideals are realized by projections — for projections p, q the more interesting product $ApqA$ is obtained by multiplying left ideal Ap with right ideal qA, while right quantale structure on R gives only $pAqA$ which can be calculated as a right action of two-sided AqA on pA. This fact was recognized by J. Rosický [14] and studied in a context of *quantum frames*.

The aim of this paper is to formalize the relationship among one- and two- sided ideals and to construct a quantale subsuming the structure. Dropping Q from the Van den Bossche quantaloid but preserving all remaining compositions and associative laws we obtain a basic example of what is called *quantum triad* (L, T, R). The quantum triads, or shortly just triads, can be understood as multiplicative Chu spaces but notice that morphisms of triads (which are not studied here) would arise from ring morphisms and this is a different philosophy then the one of Chu spaces.

The fill-in by quantale Q in $(*)$ is an instance of *solution* of the triad (L, T, R). It is shown that every triad has two extremal solutions denoted by Q_0 and Q_1 and they enclose a category of all solutions. The solution Q_0 is realized by tensor product $R \otimes_T L$ while Q_1 is a generalization of a quantale of endomorphisms. The results are based on a special case studied in [4] and further communication with J. Egger and the idea of P. Resende [12] who constructed Q_1 for the case of Galois connections. The quantales Q_0, Q_1 reflects two aspects of the quantization of topology — it is a non-commutative intersection represented by multiplication on Q_0, and transitivity of states represented by actions of Q_1 on L and R.

We discuss properties when L, T, R appears as left-, two-, and right-sided elements of a solution, that is when the solution represents a unique object covering all components of the triad. A special attention is kept to involutive ($L \cong R$) and Girard ($L^{\mathrm{op}} \cong R$) triads. In particular, solutions of a triad given by a complete orthomodular lattice represents a contribution to topics of dynamical aspects of quantum logic [2].

Since one can find other examples of quantum triads outside lattice theory, it is reasonable to work with a maximal generality. The author presents here only applications in sup-lattices and uses an algebraic language. A categorical approach will be presented in a separate paper [8].

2 Preliminaries

Recall that a *category of sup-lattices* consists of complete lattices as objects and suprema preserving maps as morphisms. Every sup-lattice morphism $f : S \to S'$ has an *adjoint* $f^{\dashv} : S' \to S$ given by $f(x) \leq y \Leftrightarrow x \leq f^{\dashv}(y)$ which preserves all infima. By dualizing S and S' we obtain a sup-lattice morphism denoted by $f^* : (S')^{\mathrm{op}} \to S^{\mathrm{op}}$. A map $f : S \times S' \to S''$ of sup-lattices is called a *bimorphism* if it is a morphism in both variables, i.e. fixing an element of $x \in S$ (or $y \in S'$) we obtain morphism $f(x, -) : S' \to S''$ (or $f(-, y) : S \to S''$). When the bimorphism is apparent, an element $f(x, y)$ is understood as a products and denoted by xy. The adjoints of $f(x, -), f(-, y)$ are referred as *residuations* and denoted by $- \leftarrow x, y \to -$.

A *quantale* Q is a sup-lattice equipped by an associative bimorphism $Q \times Q \to Q$. The top or bottom element is denoted by 1 or 0, respectively. The quantale is called

unital if it admits a unit $e \in Q$, i.e. $qe = q = eq$ for every $q \in Q$,

semiunital if $q \leq q1 \wedge 1q$ for every $q \in Q$,

strictly two-sided if it is unital and the unit coincide with the top element,

Girard if admits an element $d \in Q$ which is *cyclic*, i.e. $qq' \leq d \Leftrightarrow q'q \leq d$, and *dualizing*, i.e. $q = d \leftarrow (q \to d) = (d \leftarrow q) \to d$, for every $q, q' \in Q$. The element $q^{\perp} = q \to d = d \leftarrow q$ is regarded as a *complement* of q.

A quantale Q is called *involutive* if it is equipped by a unary operation * of *involution* provided that $(q^*)^* = q$, $(qq')^* = (q')^* q^*$ and $(\bigvee q_i)^* = \bigvee q_i^*$ for all $q, q', q_i \in Q$.

An element $q \in Q$ is said to be *right-, left-,* or *two-sided* if $q1 \leq q, 1q \leq q$ or both the inequalities hold, respectively. The respective sup-lattices are denoted by $\mathcal{R}(Q), \mathcal{L}(Q), \mathcal{T}(Q)$. Recall that every unital quantale is semiunital and in a semiunital quantale it holds that $r1 = r, 1l = l$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}(Q), l \in \mathcal{L}(Q)$. Since $1^* = 1$ in any involutive quantale, the involution provides a sup-lattice isomorphism between $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ and $\mathcal{L}(Q)$.

A sup-lattice morphism $f : Q \to K$ between quantales Q, K is called a *(involutive) quantale morphism* if it preserves the multiplication (and the involution), i.e. $f(qq') = f(q)f(q')$ (and $f(q^*) = f(q)^*$). The morphism f is called *strong* if it preserves the top element, i.e. $f(1_Q) = 1_K$. It follows easily that a strong morphism preserve also right- and left-sided elements.

The two-element sup-lattice $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$, as well as any frame, will be regarded as a unital (involutive) quantale with multiplication $\wedge$ (and trivial involution).

A sup-lattice M is called a *left Q-module* if there is a bimorphism $Q \times M \to M$ associative with the quantale multiplication, i.e. $(qq')m = q(q'm)$ for every $q, q' \in Q, m \in M$. M is said to be unital when Q is unital and $em = m$ for every $m \in M$. Right modules are defined in an analogous way. M is called a *(Q, Q')-bimodule* for quantales Q, Q' if it is left Q-module, right Q'-module and it holds that $(qm)q' = q(mq')$ for every $q \in Q, m \in M, q' \in Q'$. Notice that every quantale Q is automatically (Q, Q)-bimodule. Categories of left Q-modules, right Q'-modules and (Q, Q')-bimodules are denoted by $Q\text{-Mod}, \text{Mod-}Q, Q\text{-Mod-}Q'$, respectively. A sup-lattice morphism $f : M \to M'$ between two left Q-modules is called a *Q-module morphism* if $f(qm) = qf(m)$ for every $q \in Q, m \in M$, etc.

Quantales C, Q together with a morphism $\phi : C \to Q$ are called a *couple of quantales* if C is a (Q, Q)-bimodule, ϕ is a (Q, Q)-bimodule morphism and it holds that $cc' = \phi(c)c' = c\phi(c')$ for every $c, c' \in C$.

A couple $C \xrightarrow{\phi} Q$ is said to be

unital if Q is unital and C is a unital (Q, Q)-module,

Girard if C admits a cyclic dualizing element d, but now with respect to the bimodule actions, i.e. $qc \leq d \Leftrightarrow cq \leq d$, $q = d \leftarrow (q \to d) = (d \leftarrow q) \to d$, where the residuations are calculated as adjoints of $q-, -q : C \to C$, and $c = d \leftarrow (c \to d) = (d \leftarrow c) \to d$ with residuations adjoint to $c-, -c : Q \to C$, for all $q \in Q, c \in C$.

3 Triads and solutions

3.1 Definition. A *(quantum) triad* consists of the following data:

- quantale T,
- right T-module R,
- left T-module L,
- and bimorphism $L \times R \to T$ compatible with the module actions,

i.e., there are four bimorphisms, referred as (TT, RT, TL, LR), satisfying all the five reasonable associative laws (TTT, TTL, RTT, LRT, TLR).

3.2 Definition. A quantale Q is said to be a *solution* of triad (L, T, R) if

- R is a (Q, T)-bimodule,

- L is a (T, Q)-bimodule,
- there is a compatible bimorphism $R \times L \to Q, (r, l) \mapsto rl$,

which means that we add further four bimorphisms (QQ, QR, LQ, RL) and require all the remaining associative laws (QQQ, LQQ, QQR, TLQ, QRT, QRL, RLQ, RTL, LQR, RLR, LRL) for scheme $(*)$.

3.3 Example. (1) Let Q be a quantale. Then $(\mathcal{L}(Q), \mathcal{T}(Q), \mathcal{R}(Q))$ is a triad and Q is a solution.

(2) Let A be a ring. As mentioned in Introduction we assume L, T, R to be sup-lattices of left-, two-, and right-sided ideals. As solution we can consider a quantale of all additive subgroups of A or a quantale of those subgroups that are modules over the center of A.

(3) When A is a C*-algebra, it is possible to consider only ideals closed in norm topology. Then spectrum $\operatorname{Max} A$ consisting of all closed subspaces [10] is a solution.

(4) Let S be a sup-lattice. Putting

$$xy = \begin{cases} 0, & y \leq x, \\ 1, & y \nleq x \end{cases}$$

for $x, y \in S$ we obtain a bilinear map $S^{\mathrm{op}} \times S \to \mathbf{2}$. Since every sup-lattice is a unital $\mathbf{2}$-module, we get a triad $(S^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{2}, S)$. Quantale $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ of all sup-lattice endomorphisms [11] of S and quantale $\mathcal{C}(S) = S \otimes S^{\mathrm{op}}$ are clearly solutions of the triad [4].

(5) Let H be a Hilbert space. Then left ideals of operator algebra $\mathcal{B}(H)$ closed in normal topology, as well as those right ideals, can be identified with closed subspaces of H. The sup-lattice is denoted by $L(H)$. The only closed two-sided ideals are $\{0\}$ and A, hence we obtain a triad $(L(H), \mathbf{2}, L(H))$ which is a special case of (4). Except $\mathcal{Q}(L(H)), \mathcal{C}(L(H))$ there are also solutions $\operatorname{Max} \mathcal{B}(H), \operatorname{Max}_{\sigma w} \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $\operatorname{Max}_1 \mathcal{C}(H)$ (see [4]).

(6) Let S, S' be sup-lattices and $f : S \to S', g : S' \to S$ Galois connections, i.e. $f(x) \leq y \Leftrightarrow x \geq g(y)$ for every $x \in S, y \in S'$. In that case we write $x \perp y$ and put $xy = 0$, or 1 otherwise. We have obtained a triad $(S, \mathbf{2}, S')$. *Galois quantale* $Q = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{Q}(S) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(S') \mid \alpha(x) \perp y \Leftrightarrow x \perp \beta(y)\}$ constructed in [12] is a solution of the triad. Notice that (4) is a special case for duality $f : S \to S^{\mathrm{op}}, g : S^{\mathrm{op}} \to S$.

(7) For a quantum frame F (see [14]) we consider triad $(F, \tilde{F}, F)$ where $\tilde{F}$ is a frame of two-sided elements of F, and actions are defined by

$$xz = zx = x \wedge z, \qquad \text{(RT, TL)} \qquad xy = x \circ y \qquad \text{(LR)}$$

for $x, y \in F, z \in \tilde{F}$. As elements of a quantum frame represent q-open sets in quantized topology (see [5]), a solution of the triad provides a "dynamical logic of quantised topology". In contrast to other candidates like $\mathcal{Q}(F)$, solutions respect the underlying classical topology represented by two-sided elements (central q-open sets).

(8) A special instance of (7) (and generalization of (5)) is a complete orthomodular lattice M. The quantum frame structure defined by J. Rosický yields a triad $(M, Z(M), M)$ where $Z(M)$ is a center of M. Notice that $x \circ y$ can be calculated also as $|x \dot{\wedge} y|$, i.e. a central cover of skew meet (also known as Sasaki projection $\phi_x(y) = x \dot{\wedge} y = (x \vee y^{\perp}) \wedge y$), and $x \dot{\wedge} y$ coincide with $x \wedge y$ whenever x or y is central. This suggests further examples emerging from skew operations.

Let us recall that $R \otimes L$ is calculated as a free sup-lattice on $R \times L$ factorized by congruence generated by relations

$$\bigvee (r_i, l) \sim \left(\bigvee r_i, l\right), \qquad \bigvee (r, l_i) \sim \left(r, \bigvee l_i\right)$$

for all $r, r_i \in R, l, l_i \in L$. Every element of $R \otimes L$ representable by some (r, l) is called a *pure tensor* and denoted by $r \otimes l$.

3.4 Lemma. *Let (L, T, R) be an triad in $\mathcal{S}up$. Let $R \otimes_T L$ be a sup-lattice quotient of $R \otimes L$ via $(rt) \otimes l \sim r \otimes (tl)$ assumed for any $r \in R, l \in L, t \in T$. Let Q_0 be defined as $R \otimes_T L$ with operations*

$$\begin{aligned} (r \otimes l)r' &= r(lr'), && \text{(QR)} & l(r \otimes l') &= (lr)l', && \text{(LQ)} \\ (r \otimes l)(r' \otimes l') &= (r(lr')) \otimes l', && \text{(QQ)} & rl &= r \otimes l && \text{(RL)} \end{aligned}$$

for $r, r' \in R, l, l' \in L$. Then Q_0 is a solution of (L, T, R).

Proof. Since pure tensors are generators of $R \otimes L$ which is "bifree" on $R \times L$, the assignments extend to all elements in a unique way. Correctness follows from definition of $R \otimes_T L$. All the associative laws can be proved only for pure tensors and the proof is straightforward. ☐

3.5 Lemma. *Let (L, T, R) be an triad in $\mathcal{S}up$. Put*

$$Q_1 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in T\text{-Mod}(L, L) \times \text{Mod-}T(R, R) \mid \alpha(l)r = l\beta(r)\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha, \beta)r &= \beta(r), && \text{(QR)} & l(\alpha, \beta) &= \alpha(l), && \text{(LQ)} \\ (\alpha, \beta)(\alpha', \beta') &= (\alpha'\alpha, \beta\beta'), && \text{(QQ)} & rl &= ((-r)l, r(l-)). && \text{(RL)} \end{aligned}$$

Then Q_1 is a solution of (L, T, R).

Proof. For every $l \in L, r \in R, (\alpha, \beta), (\alpha', \beta') \in Q_1$ we have $(\alpha'\alpha)(l)r = \alpha(l)\beta'(r) = (\beta\beta')(r)$, hence $(\alpha, \beta)(\alpha', \beta') \in Q_1$. The associative law (QQQ) evidently holds and R, L are Q_1-modules (QQR, LQQ). Since elements of Q_1 are formed by T-module morphisms, R, L are also bimodules (QRT,TLQ). Elements of the form rl belongs to Q_1 thanks to (TLR, TTL, LRT, RTT), and consequently (RLR, LRL, RTL) hold. (LQR) follows by definition: $(l(\alpha, \beta))r = \alpha(l)r = l\beta(r) = l((\alpha, \beta)r)$. Finally, $((\alpha, \beta)r)l = \beta(r)l = ((-\beta(r))l, \beta(r)(l-)) = ((\alpha(-)r)l, \beta(r(l-))) = (\alpha, \beta)(rl)$ gives (QRL) and similarly we would prove (RLQ). ☐

3.6 Definition. Let $C \xrightarrow{\phi} Q$ be a couple. A quantale K together with quantale morphisms $\phi_0 : C \to K, \phi_1 : K \to Q$ such that $\phi_1\phi_0 = \phi$ is called a *couple factorization* if the K-bimodule structure on C obtained by restricting scalars along ϕ_1 makes ϕ_0 a coupling map. Namely, it holds that

$$\phi_0(\phi_1(k)c) = k\phi_0(c), \qquad \phi_0(c\phi_1(k)) = \phi_0(c)k$$

for all $c \in C, k \in K$.

3.7 Theorem. *Let Q be a solution of triad (L, T, R). The assignment $\phi(r \otimes l) = ((-r)l, r(l-))$ determines a unital couple $Q_0 \xrightarrow{\phi} Q_1$, and Q is a solution of the triad iff there is a couple factorization $Q_0 \xrightarrow{\phi_0} Q \xrightarrow{\phi_1} Q_1$.*

Proof. From (RTL, LRL, TLR, RLR, LRT) it follows that whenever Q is a solution then $\phi_0 : Q_0 \to Q$ given by $\phi_0(r \otimes l) = rl$ is a correctly defined quantale morphism and together with (LQQ, QQR, QRL, RLQ) it determines a couple with actions $q(r \otimes l) = (qr) \otimes l$ and $(r \otimes l)q = r \otimes (lq)$. In particular $\phi : Q_0 \to Q_1$ is a couple and it is unital since $(id_L, id_R) \in Q_1$. Further, if Q is a solution then (LQQ, QQR, TLQ, QRT, LQR) yield that $\phi_1(q) = (-q, q-)$ defines a quantale morphism $\phi_1 : Q \to Q_1$. Clearly, $\phi = \phi_1\phi_0$ and $\phi_0(\phi_1(q)(r \otimes l)) = \phi_0((\phi_1(q)r) \otimes l) = (qr)l = q(rl) = q\phi_0(r \otimes l)$ and similarly $\phi_0((r \otimes l)\phi_1(q)) = \phi_0(r \otimes l)q$, hence $\phi = \phi_1\phi_0$ is a couple factorization.

Conversely, for a couple factorization $\phi = \phi_1\phi_0$ we put

$$lq = l\phi_1(q), \quad \text{(LQ)} \qquad qr = \phi_1(q)r, \quad \text{(QR)}$$
$$rl = \phi_0(r \otimes l). \quad \text{(RL)}$$

Then (TLQ, QRT, LQR) follow immediatelly, (LQQ, QQR) hold since ϕ_1 is a quantale morphism, (LRL, RLR, RTL) since ϕ_0 is a coupling map, and (QRL, RLQ) since $\phi = \phi_1\phi_0$ is a couple factorization. ☐

3.8 Definition. A triad (L, T, R) is called
strong if $l \leq (l1_R)1_L$ and $r \leq 1_R(1_Lr)$ for every $l \in L, r \in R$,
unital if T is a unital quantale and L, R are unital T-modules, and
strict if it is strong, unital, and $1_L1_R = e_T$.

3.9 Remark. The triad in Example 3.3 (1) is strict iff Q is semiunital. Examples (2 – 8) provide strict triads.

3.10 Proposition. *(1) $\phi : Q_0 \to Q_1$ is strong iff (L, T, R) is strong.*

(2) If (L, T, R) is strict, then $\mathcal{L}(Q_0) \cong \mathcal{L}(Q_1) \cong L, \mathcal{R}(Q_0) \cong \mathcal{R}(Q_1) \cong R$ (as modules over any solution) and $\mathcal{T}(Q_0) \cong \mathcal{T}(Q_1) \cong T$ (as quantales). In particular, T is strictly two-sided.

Proof. (1) If ϕ is strong, then $r = e_{Q_1}r \leq 1_{Q_1}r = \phi(1_{Q_0})r = 1_{Q_0}r = (1_R \otimes 1_L)r = 1_R1_Lr$ and similarly for $l \in L$.

Conversely, let (L, T, R) be strong. Then for $r, r' \in R$ we have $r \leq 1_R1_Lr' \Rightarrow 1_R1_Lr \leq (1_R1_L)^2r' = 1_R1_Lr'$. Since 1_{Q_1} acts as a T-module endomorphism, $1_{Q_1}(1_R1_Lr) = 1_{Q_1}(1_R)1_Lr = 1_R1_Lr$. We have $1_{Q_1}r = \bigwedge_{r \leq 1_R1_Lr'} 1_R1_Lr' = 1_R1_Lr = (1_R \otimes 1_L)r = 1_{Q_0}r$. In a similar way we prove that $l1_{Q_1} = l1_{Q_0}$, hence $\phi(1_{Q_0}) = 1_{Q_1}$.

(2) Due to [4], ϕ is an isomorphism on right- and left-sided elements. Assume that $\rho \in \mathcal{R}(Q_1)$ and put $r = \rho 1_R$. Then $\rho = \rho 1_{Q_1}$ yields that ρ acts as $\rho 1_{Q_1} = \rho 1_R 1_L = r1_L$ on both L and R. Since (L, T, R) is strict, we can recover $r = re_T = r1_L1_R$. On the other hand, $(-r1_L, r1_L-) = \phi(r \otimes 1_L) \in Q_1$ is right-sided because $r1_L1_R1_L = r1_L$. Similarly we check left-sided elements.

Every element $t \in T$ can be associated with $(-1_Rt1_L, 1_Rt1_L-)$ which is clearly both right- and left-sided in Q_1 and from 1_Rt1_L can be recovered as $t = 1_L1_Rt1_L1_R$. Conversely, every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$ yields $t = 1_L\tau 1_R$ and then acts as 1_Rt1_L. For $t, t' \in T$ we have $1_Rt1_L1_Rt'1_L = 1_Rtt'1_L$, hence we have obtained a quantale isomorphism. ☐

3.11 Remark. Recall that a quantale Q is *faithful* [11] if $\forall l \in \mathcal{L}(Q), r \in \mathcal{R}(Q)$ $lq = lq'$ and $qr = q'r$ implies that $q = q'$ for every $q, q' \in Q$.

In the case of a strict triad we have obtained that Q_0 is generated by its right- and left-sided elements while Q_1 is faithful.

4 Central, involutive, and Girard triads

4.1 Definition. A triad (L, T, R) is called *central* if LR is a subset of the center $Z(T)$ of T, i.e. $lrt = tlr$ for every $l \in L, t \in T, r \in R$.

The following statement exhibits analogs of an embedding of a center and of a trace in operator algebras.

4.2 Proposition. *Let* (L, T, R) *be a central triad. Then assignment* $t \mapsto (t-, -t)$ *defines a quantale morphism* $\zeta : T \to Q_1$ *and assignment* $r \otimes l \mapsto lr$ *a sup-lattice morphism* $\tau : Q_0 \to T$. *Elements of* $\zeta(T)$ *are central in* Q_1 *and elements of* $\tau^{\dashv}(T)$ *are cyclic for any couple of solutions* $Q_0 \overset{\phi_0}{\to} Q$.

Proof. For every $t \in T$ and $r \in R, l \in L$ we have $tlr = lrt$, hence $\zeta(t) \in Q_1$. For $t, t' \in T$ we get $\zeta(t)\zeta(t') = ((t-) \circ (t'-), (-t') \circ (-t) = (tt'-, -tt') = \zeta(tt')$. Finally, for $(\alpha, \beta) \in Q_1$ we have $\zeta(t)(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha(t-), \beta(-)t) = (t\alpha(-), \beta(-t)) = (\alpha, \beta)\zeta(t)$.

Since lr is central for every $l \in L, r \in R$, $\tau(rt \otimes l) = lrt = tlr = \tau(r \otimes tl)$ yields correctness of τ. For $q \in Q$ we have $\tau(q(r \otimes l)) = \tau((qr) \otimes l) = lqr \leq t \Leftrightarrow \tau((r \otimes l)q) \leq t$, i.e. $\tau^{\dashv}(t)$ is cyclic. ☐

4.3 Definition. An triad (L, T, R) is called *involutive* if T is involutive and there is an isomorphism $L \overset{*}{\cong} R$ such that

$$(tl)^* = l^* t^*, \qquad (rt)^* = t^* r^*,$$
$$(lr)^* = r^* l^*$$

for all $r \in R, l \in L, t \in T$.

A solution Q of involutive triad (L, T, R) is called *involutive* if Q is an involutive quantale and

$$(qr)^* = r^* q^*, \qquad (lq)^* = q^* l^*,$$
$$(rl)^* = l^* r^*$$

for all $q \in Q, r \in R, l \in L$.

A couple $C \overset{\phi}{\to} Q$ is said to be *involutive* if ϕ is an involutive morphism of involutive quantales and $(qc)^* = c^* q^*$ for every $q \in Q, c \in C$. A couple factorization $C \overset{\phi_0}{\to} K \overset{\phi_1}{\to} Q$ is called *involutive* if K is an involutive quantale and ϕ_0, ϕ_1 are involutive morphisms.

4.4 Theorem. *If* (L, T, R) *is an involutive triad, then* $Q_0 \overset{\phi}{\to} Q_1$ *is an involutive couple. Involutive solutions correspond to involutive couple factorizations of* ϕ.

Proof. On Q_0 put $(r \otimes l)^* = l^* \otimes r^*$. On Q_1 put $(\alpha, \beta)^* = (\bar{\beta}, \bar{\alpha})$ where $\bar{\alpha}(r) = \alpha(r^*)^*$ and $\bar{\beta}(l) = \beta(l^*)^*$. The rest follows straightforwards. ☐

A triad (L, T, R) is said to be *Girard* if T admits a cyclic element d_T such that assignment

$$r \leq l^{\perp} (\Leftrightarrow l \leq r^{\perp}) \Leftrightarrow lr \leq d_T$$

provides a duality $L^{\mathrm{op}} \overset{\perp}{\cong} R$.

4.5 Theorem. *If (L, T, R) is a Girard triad, then $Q_1 \cong T\text{-}\mathrm{Mod}(L, L) \cong \mathrm{Mod}\text{-}T(R, R)$ and $\phi : Q_0 \to Q_1$ is a Girard couple.*

Proof. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in Q_1$. Then $\alpha(r) \leq r' \Leftrightarrow (r')^{\perp}\alpha(r) = \beta((r')^{\perp})r \leq d_T \Leftrightarrow r \leq \beta((r')^{\perp})^{\perp}$. We have proved that $\beta = \alpha^*$ and hence the assertion.

Put $d_Q = \bigvee_{lr \leq d_T} r \otimes l$. For $l \in L, t \in T, r \in R$ we have $lrt \leq d_T \Leftrightarrow tlr \leq d_T$ by cyclicity, hence $r \otimes l \leq d_Q \Leftrightarrow lr \leq d_T$, regardless how the pure tensor $r \otimes l$ is represented in $R \otimes_T L$.

Now put $\pi_l^{l'} = \bigvee \{\alpha \in T\text{-}\mathrm{Mod}(L, L) \mid \alpha(l) \leq l'\}$ and observe that

$$\alpha = \bigwedge_{\alpha(l) \leq l'} \pi_l^{l'}$$

for every $\alpha \in T\text{-}\mathrm{Mod}(L, L)$. Then $\alpha(tl) \leq r^{\perp} \Leftrightarrow \alpha(tl)r = t\alpha(l)r \leq d_T \Leftrightarrow \alpha(l)(rt) \leq d_T \Leftrightarrow \alpha(l) \leq (rt)^{\perp}$ yields that $\pi_l^{(rt)^{\perp}} = \pi_{tl}^{r^{\perp}}$ and thus pure tensors of $R \otimes_T L$ are duals of πs. Since elements of $T\text{-}\mathrm{Mod}(L, L)$ preserve arbitrary suprema, we deduce that they are, as the meets of πs, organized dually to joins of pure tensors and hence $Q_1 \cong T\text{-}\mathrm{Mod}(L, L)$ is dual to Q_0. (This fact was mentioned by A. Joyal and M. Tierney [6] for commutative T.) Finally, $(r \otimes l)(\alpha, \alpha^*) = r \otimes \alpha(l) \leq d_Q \Leftrightarrow \alpha(l)r \leq d_T \Leftrightarrow \alpha(l) \leq r^{\perp} \Leftrightarrow \alpha \leq \pi_l^{r^{\perp}} = (r \otimes l)^{\perp}$ establishes the Girard duality. $\square$

Recall from [9] that a quantale Q is said to be *strictly faithful* if $(\forall l \in \mathcal{L}(Q), r \in \mathcal{R}(Q)\ lqr = lq'r) \Rightarrow q = q'$ for all $q, q' \in Q$ and from [7] that it is called *distributive* if $(r \vee q) \wedge (l \vee q) = rl \vee q$ for all $q, q' \in Q, r \in \mathcal{R}(Q), l \in \mathcal{L}(Q)$.

4.6 Proposition. *Let (L, T, R) be a strict Girard triad. Then Q_1 is strictly faithful and if T is distributive, then Q_1 is distributive.*

Proof. By 3.10 we can identify L with $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ and R with $\mathcal{R}(Q)$. If $r \not\geq r'$ then $r^{\perp}r \leq d_T$ but $r^{\perp}r' \not\leq d_T$, hence $(\forall l \in L\ lr = lr') \Rightarrow r = r'$ for every $r, r' \in R$. Thus from $lqr = lq'r$ for all $r \in R, l \in L$ we derive $qr = q'r$ for all $r \in R$. By a similar argument one can also derive $lq = lq'$ for all $l \in L$. We have that q and q' are not distinguished either on L or on R and thus they are equal.

Assume now that T is distributive and $l'(rl \vee q)r' \leq t$ for $l, l' \in L, r, r' \in R, q \in Q$, thus $l'rlr' \leq t$ and $l'qr' \leq t$. Then $l'((r \vee q) \wedge (l \vee q))r' \leq (l'rr' \vee l'qr') \wedge (l'lr' \vee l'qr') \leq (l'r \vee t) \wedge (lr' \vee t) = l'rlr' \vee t = t$. From strict faithfulness we obtain $(r \vee q) \wedge (l \vee q) \leq rl \vee q$. The converse inequality always holds. $\square$

4.7 Remark. Since T is a frame in examples $(3-8)$ of 3.3, the triads are central and solutions Q_1 are distributive.

Involutive triads arise from involutive rings (in particular C*-algebras), self-dual sup-lattices, symmetric Galois connections, and quantum frames.

Triad $(S^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{2}, S)$ is Girard for every sup-lattice S and $\phi : Q_0 \to Q_1$ is the Girard couple studied in [4]. More generally, the triad $(M, Z(M), M)$ from 3.3 (8) is Girard.

Any W*-algebra provides a Girard triad of ideals closed in normal topology. The quantale Q_1 obtained from non-atomistic W*-algebra is distributive but non-spatial (because it does not have enough maximal right-sided elements) and represents a natural non-commutative analogy of a pointfree locale. W*-algebras with a non-trivial center produce examples of strictly faithful quantales (with idempotent right- and left-sided elements) which are not *simple* (see [11]).

References

[1] Borceux, F., Rosický, J., and Van den Bossche, G. Quantales and C*-algebras. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society 40* (1989), 398–404.

[2] Coecke, B., Moore, D. J., and Wilce, A. Operational quantum logic: an overview. In *Current Research in Operational Quantum Logic* (2000), Kluwer, pp. 1–36.

[3] Coniglio, M. E., and Miraglia, F. Modules in the category of sheaves over quantales. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 108* (2001), 103–136.

[4] Egger, J., and Kruml, D. Girard couples of quantales. *Applied Categorical Structures* (2008). Submitted.

[5] Giles, R., and Kummer, H. A non-commutative generalization of topology. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal 21(1)* (1971), 91–102.

[6] Joyal, A., and Tierney, M. *An Extension of the Galois Theory of Grothendieck*, vol. 309 of *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*. 1984.

[7] Kruml, D. Distributive quantales. *Applied categorical structures 11* (2003), 561–566.

[8] Kruml, D. Quantum triads: a categorical approach. In preparation.

[9] Kruml, D., and Paseka, J. On simple and semisimple quantales. In *Proceedings of the 9th Prague Topological Symposium* (2002), Topology Atlas.

[10] Mulvey, C. J., and Pelletier, J. W. On the quantisation of points. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 159* (2001), 231–295.

[11] Pelletier, J. W., and Rosický, J. Simple involutive quantales. *Journal of Algebra 195* (1997), 367–386.

[12] Resende, P. Sup-lattice 2-forms and quantales. *Journal of Algebra 276* (2004), 143–167.

[13] Román, L. Orthomodular lattices and quantales. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics 44* (2005), 783–791.

[14] Rosický, J. Multiplicative lattices and C*-algebras. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques XXX-2* (1989), 95–110.

[15] Stubbe, I. *Categorical structures enriched in a quantaloid: categories and semicategories*. PhD thesis, Universit Catholique de Louvain, 2003.

[16] Van den Bossche, G. Quantaloids and non-commutative ring representations. *Applied Categorical Structures 3* (1995), 305–320.